IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF AUGUST
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B. SUDERSHAN REDDY

and

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.C. BHANU

WRIT PETITION No.6791 of 2004

Between:

R.Venkat Reddy, S/o.Sri Kodandaram Reddy,
R/o. Hanamkonda, Warangal District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 M.Vanitha, W/o. Ramreddy,
R/o.H.No.2-7-1273, Vijayapaul Colony,
Vaddepalli, Hanamkonda, Warangal Dist.

2 The Special Tribunal under Land Grabbing

(Prohibition) Act, Warangal.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, more particularly one in the nature of writ of Mandamus; declaring that the proceedings in E.P.No.68/1998 in

LGC.No.3/1991 dated 28-07-2000 as arbitrary, illegal and consequently direct the respondent No.2 to fix appropriate compensation for the extent of 71 sq.Yards.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR. A. Sudershan Reddy

Counsel for Respondent No.1: Mr. T.S. Anand.

Counsel for Respondent No.2: GP for Assignment.

The Court made the following :

ORDER:(Per BRSR,J)

We find no merit in this writ petition. The writ petition, in our considered opinion, is not only misconceived but also speculative in its nature. The order declaring the petitioner as land grabber within the meaning of the provisions of the A.P. Land Grabbing (Prohibition) Act, 1982, has attained the finality, and more particularly, in view of the dismissal of the S.L.P. filed by the petitioner in the Supreme Court. The questions that were raised in the earlier proceedings cannot be allowed to be raised by the petitioner in this petition, either in direct or indirect manner.

The notice issued by the Special Tribunal in E.P. No.68 of 1998 by itself is not vitiated by any error apparent on the face of the record requiring our interference in exercise of our jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The petitioner is entitled to raise only such objections, if permissible in law to the notice issued by the 2nd respondent other than the objections raised by him in the earlier proceedings.

With the observations as above, the Writ Petition shall stand dismissed. No order as to costs.

B. SUDERSHAN REDDY, J

Date:18-08-2004

_____

K.C. BHANU, J

PV

To

1. The Chairman,

Special Tribunal under Land Grabbing

(Prohibition) Act, Warangal.

2. Two C.Cs. to G.P. for Assignment, High Court of A.P.,

Hyderabad(O.U.T).

3. Two C.Ds.